UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,109	07/24/2001	Yoshifumi Sakamoto	JP920000036US1	4474

54856 7590 08/22/2007

LOUIS PAUL HERZBERG
3 CLOVERDALE LANE
MONSEY, NY 10952

EXAMINER	
HUYNH, SON P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/912,109	SAKAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Son P. Huynh	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 June 2007 and 14 May 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 July 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/5/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument, "Tanigawa uses a Web browser over and over. Tanigawa is not concerned with a browserless technique. See for example, Tanigawa col. 9, lines 23 and 25, Tanigawa col. 28, line 66, and Tanigawa col. 23, lines 7-13 reads: .... the processes presented by these tags can be performed in the same way as a conventional browser...." (page 10-page 13), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Tanigawa discussed about conventional browser in order to compare with the invention or to highlight the advantage of his invention. Tanigawa discloses the processes represented by these tags can be performed in the same way as a conventional browser (col. 23, lines 7-9). Tanigawa does not disclose or indicate the tags can be performed by a conventional browser. Particularly, Tanigawa discloses the present embodiment describes the case when in order to display WWW home pages on the Internet, the data communication system 100 uses a one to many TV broadcast to is perform simulated **bidirectional** communication, so that when **compared** to the case when home pages are displayed by a web browser on a personal computer... (col. 28, lines 62-67), and the advantage of the Tanigawa's invention over the use of conventional browser is "the display of the user's desired pages on the display unit can be performed at a high speed which unaffected by congestion. Since display image information is sent in a conventional TV format, the display of full color, high-resolution images can easily be achieved by the display unit, make full use of the component (while the display or display images generated by a browser for display on a TV monitor does not make full use of the component) – col. 28, line 66-col. 29, line 11. Thus, Tanigawa is concerned with "browserless browsing".

For reason above, Tanigawa's disclosure is read on a method for browsing the Web on the Internet, comprising using a browserless broadcast system.

In response to Applicant's argument that Tanigawa doesn't show "a receiving unit for receiving and decoding the transmitted video data and directly transmitting the data to a video display device" (page 13, paragraph 2), the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Tanigawa discloses the transmitted MPEG 2 is received and processed at the receiving apparatus using separating unit, received data holding unit, reproducing unit, control unit, and the processed data transmitted to display unit (e.g., display unit 154) for display (see include, but are not limited to, figure 1, col. 20, lines 13-67). Thus, the limitation "receiving unit" is read on separating unit, received data holding unit, reproducing unit, control unit; the MPEG-2 data must be decoded before it is displayed on display unit.

Applicant further argues Tanigawa fails teach a step of "establishing an association between a link provided to the video data and a position of a cursor in the video data transmitted to the video display device by comparing a position coordinate of the cursor with coordinates of points included in area links linked to other web pages and the like" (page 15, lines 18-24).

In response, this argument is respectfully traversed. Tanigawa further discloses link information including image link, web page link, etc. and position of cursor (e.g., position coordinate of the icon, cursor/supplemental design, etc. are provided in the multiplexed signal (see include, but are not limited to,
col. 3, lines 1-30, col. 4, lines 1-13, col. 5, lines 5-9, lines 56-67, col. 10, lines 36-67, col. 12, lines 15-30, col. 20, line 50-col. 21, line 12). When link areas (e.g., 1801, 1901, etc.

– figures 18-21) is selected, the cursor position is determined and a predetermined web page associated to the selected link area is retrieved (see include, but are not limited to, figures 7-11b, 16-21, 26-27, col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 10, lines 35-61, col. 12, lines 15-30, col. 13, lines 46-62, col. 20, line 50-col. 21, line 18, col. 21, lines 54-67, col. 23, lines 30-46, col. 24, lines 29-51, col. 24, line 64-col. 25, line 17, col. 27, line 19-48). Thus, an association between a link (e.g., link to web page, html page, etc.) provided to the video data and a position of a cursor (cursor position) in the video data transmitted to the video display device (e.g., display unit) must be established by comparing a position coordinate of the cursor (cursor position) with coordinate of points (e.g., based on X.Y coordinates) including in the area links (area of hot spots, or links 1801, 1901, etc.) linked to other web pages or the like so that when the cursor select a link area, predetermined web page/ html page associated with the selected area link is activated and retrieved for display.

In addition, if a position coordinate of the cursor is not compared with coordinate of points included in area links linked to other web pages and the like, how can web page/page and the like associated with the selected link area are displayed when a cursor points to and selects on a link area?

In response to Applicant's argument Tanigawa fails to show that claims 13-15, 19-20 are made obvious by Tanigawa (page 18, line 27-page 19, line 10), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner provides Karlton et al. (US 5,835,717 – see the claims), Bruck et al. (US 6,008,836 – see the claims), or Aggarwal et al. (US 6,360,227

– see claims) as just few examples to support that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to embody the procedures of a method in a "computer readable medium" or program storage device readable by machine" or "computer program product" in order that the instructions could be automatically performed by a processor.

For the reasons given above, rejections on claims 1-20 are analyzed as follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-12, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanigawa et al. (US 5,973,681).

Regarding claim 1, Tanigawa discloses a method for browsing the Web on the Internet, comprising using a browserless broadcast system (see figures 1-2, col. 19, lines 7-43, col. 20, lines 50-67, col. 28, line 61-col. 29, line 11), which includes:

a transmitting unit for compressing video data in accordance with a predetermined compression scheme and transmitting the compressed data (transmission data generating, transmitting data holding unit, transmitting data reading

unit, multiplexing unit, transmitting unit- hereinafter referred to as transmitting unit- compressing video data in MPEG-2 for transmitting over digital satellite broadcasting to the receiving apparatus 150 – see include, but is not limited to, figure 1, col. 20, lines 12-67);

and a receiving unit for receiving and decoding the transmitted video data and directly transmitting the data to a video display device (e.g., separating unit, received data holding unit, reproducing unit, and control unit, process the received MPEG-2 and transmitted the processed signal directly to display unit 154 for display (see include, but are not limited to, figure 1, col. 23, line 53-col. 25, line 18. Since the data is received in encoded MPEG-2 (col.20, lines 28-34), the received MPEG-2 data must be decoded before it is displayed), the method comprising the steps of:

converting a web page transmitted to the transmitted unit from the Internet into video data (e.g., converting page information into image data, control information, and supplementary design information - see include, but is not limited to, col. 3, lines 1-15, col. 11, lines 60-67);

compressing the video data in accordance with the predetermined compressing scheme (comprising the display image data, audio, link information, into MPEG-2 for broadcasting – col. 20, lines 13-44);

transmitting the compressed video data (transmitted the MPEG-2 stream including video stream, display image information, audio stream, audio information, and link information, etc.– see include, but are not limited to, col. 20, lines 13-67, figures 1, 11B);

receiving and decoding the transmitted video data using the receiving unit to directly transmit the decoded data to a video display device, without requiring a browser application (receiving and processing the transmitted MPEG-2 using separating unit, received data holding unit, reproducing unit, control unit, signal receiving and transmitted the processed data to display unit 154 for display – see include, but is not limited to, figure 1, col. 20, lines 13-67, col. 23, line 50-col. 24, line 50, col. 28, line 47-col. 29, line 11; the MEPG-2 data must be decoded before it is displayed. Since the receiving apparatus does not have a browser (discussed in "Response to Argument" above), the processed data is directly transmitted to the display unit without requiring a browser application).

Tanigawa further discloses link information including image link, web page link, etc. and position of cursor (e.g., position coordinate of the icon, cursor/supplemental design, etc. are provided in the multiplexed signal (see include, but are not limited to, col. 3, lines 1-30, col. 4, lines 1-13, col. 5, lines 5-9, lines 56-67, col. 10, lines 36-67, col. 12, lines 15-30, col. 20, line 50-col. 21, line 12). When link areas (e.g., 1801, 1901, etc. – figures 18-21) is selected, the cursor position is determined and a predetermined web page associated to the selected link area is retrieved (see include, but are not limited to, figures 7-11b, 16-21, 26-27, col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 10, lines 35-61, col. 12, lines 15-30, col. 13, lines 46-62, col. 20, line 50-col. 21, line 18, col. 21, lines 54-67, col. 23, lines 30-46, col. 24, lines 29-51, col. 24, line 64-col. 25, line 17, col. 27, line 19-48). Thus, an association between a link (e.g., link to web page, html page, etc.) provided to the video data and a position of a cursor (cursor position) in the video data transmitted to the

video display device (e.g., display unit) must be established by comparing a position coordinate of the cursor (cursor position) with coordinate of points (e.g., based on X.Y coordinates) including in the area links (area of hot spots, or links 1801, 1901, etc.) linked to other web pages or the like so that when the cursor select a link area, predetermined web page/ html page associated with the selected area link is activated and retrieved for display.

Regarding claim 2, Tanigawa discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Tanigawa further discloses converting a web page comprises providing the link to the video data on the basis of a link provided to the web page (e.g., providing link such as link web page, or html page, etc. to video data, display image or video stream, or MEPG stream based on link (e.g., link to tokyo.html, link to weather.au, or link to www.wbc.com., etc., provided in the web page - see include, but is not limited to, figures 7-10, col. 10, line 23-col. 11, line 67, col. 12, lines 15-42),

the step of transmitting the compressed video data comprises transmitting the compressed video data and information about the link (transmitting the video data comprising transmitting MPEG-2 including video stream, display image, link information, audio information, etc. - see figures 1, 11B, col. 18, line 38-col. 19, line 43, col. 20, line 13-col. 21, line 30).

Regarding claim 3, Tanigawa discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Tanigawa further discloses providing a link to the video data comprising:

extracting a web address linked to the link provided to the web page (e.g. extracting address/link information linked to "report.html" page, "tokyo.html" page, or read the URL, etc. provided to the web page– see include, but is not limited to, figures 2-10, col. 2, line 50-col. 3, line 8, col. 7, line 60-col. 9, line 61);

placing the link in the video data on the basis of the position of the link provided to the web page (placing the link information including cursor position, page information, coordinate, etc. in the multiplexed stream/ MPEG stream on the basis of the cursor position of the link, or link information, etc. provided to the web page - see include, but is not limited to, figures 7-11b, col. 2, line 50-col. 3, line 8; col. 8, lines 30-64, col. 10, lines 1-67, col. 12, lines 15-30, col. 13, lines 35-62, col. 20, line 13-col. 21, line 18).

Regarding claim 4, Tanigawa discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 2. Tanigawa additionally discloses the step of receiving and decoding the transmitted video data comprises:

decoding the received data (the received MPEG-2 data must be decoded before it is displayed – discussed in rejection of claim 1 above);

transmitting the decoded data to the video display device (transmitting decoded data to display unit 154 – figure 1, col. 24, lines 36-51);

establishing an association between the information about the link provided to the received video data and a position of a cursor in the video data transmitted to the video display device (see discussion in the rejection of claim 1 above).

Regarding claim 5, Tanigawa discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Tanigawa also discloses video data includes audio data when web page include voice or sound (broadly interpreted as the multiplexed MPEG-2 includes audio data, when web page include audio information (e.g., weather.au) – see include, but is not limited to, figures 2-3, 11b, col. 9, lines 34-39, col. 18, lines 45-59, col. 17, lines 30-42, col. 18, lines 38-44, col. 19, lines 7-31, col. 20, lines 50-63, col. 21, line 53-57).

Regarding claim 7, Tanigawa discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Tanigawa further discloses the predetermined compression scheme is an MPEP2 standard (col. 20, lines 28-67).

Regarding claims 8-9, 11-12, the limitations of the broadcast system as claimed correspond to the limitations of the method as claimed in claims 1, 3, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 7.

Regarding claims 16-18, the method as claimed is broader in scope than the method as claimed in claims 1-3, and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claims 1-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 13-15, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanigawa et al. (US 5,973,681).

Claims 13-15, 19-20 are directed toward embody the method of claims 1, 8, 16 in "computer readable medium" or "program storage device readable by machine", or "computer program product". It would have been obvious to embody the procedures of Tanigawa as discussed with respect to claims 1, 8, 16 in a "computer readable medium" or "program storage device readable by machine", or "computer program product" in order that the instructions could be automatically performed by a processor.

7. Claims 6, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanigawa et al. (US 5,973,681) as applied to claim 4 or claim 8 above, and in view of Mao et al. (US 7,089,579 B1).

Regarding claim 6, Tanigawa discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 4. Tanigawa also discloses the link is selected by the user, and bidirectional communication (see include, but is not limited to, col. 27, line 19-col. 29, line 32). However, Tanigawa does not explicitly disclose sending link information to the transmitting unit when any one link provided to the data transmitted to the video display is selected.

Mao discloses sending link information to the transmitting unit when the link provided to the data transmitted to the video display is selected (see col. 8, lines 5-67, figures 1,4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tanigawa to use the teaching as taught by Mao in order to improve efficiency in transmitting of content that is not stored at the receiving device.

Regarding claim 10, the additional limitations of the system as claimed correspond to the additional limitations of the method as claimed in claim 6, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 6.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hodge (US 2002/0007494 A1) discloses interactive digital program material encoder and system.

Milazzo et al. (US 7,117,517 B1) discloses method and apparatus for generating data structures for a hyperlinked television broadcast.

Field et al. (US 6,081,768) discloses mapping uniform resource locators to broadcast addresses in a television signal using processor 215 include a central

processing unit which implements an HTML-based code which is *analogous* to a Web browser (col. 7, lines 20-65) (not a web browser).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son P. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-7295. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Son P. Huynh

July 24, 2007